Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/645,368	ROGERS, JAM	ROGERS, JAMES RAY	
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ruth C. Rodriguez	3677		
All Participants:	Status of Application: _	<u> </u>		
(1) Ruth C. Rodriguez, PTO.	(3)			
(2) Kit M. Stetina, Applicant's representative.	(4)			
Date of Interview:	Time:			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)			
Part I.	,			
Rejection(s) discussed: None				
Claims discussed: 3,4,7,8,17-24				
Prior art documents discussed: None				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	\S DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a wri	tten summary of the interview, since	the substance	
		•	·	
(Evenines/ODE Signature)	nt/Amuliannila Danier	Olamakian 16 au		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representative S	signature – it appi	ropriate) ´	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Kit M. Stetina to propose an Examiner's amendment. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 17-24 were previously withdrawn as being directed to patentably distinct species. The allowed claims are not considered generic for all the claimed species. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 17-24 need to be canceled in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Kit M. Stetina approved the cancelation of the claims. Both parties agreed to make these changes through an Examiner's amendment.